

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/612,448	06/30/2003	Julie Y. Qian	SAM0014/US 5430		
75	90 04:08/2005	EXAMINER			
Dale A. Bjorkman			CHAPMAN, MARK A		
Kagan Binder, I	Kagan Binder, PLLC Maple Island Building, Suite 200 ART UNIT			PAPER NUMBER	
221 Main Street North			1756		
Stillwater, MN 55082			DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)	110	
		10/612,44		QIAN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit		
		Mark A. Cl	nanman	1756		
	The MAILING DATE of this communic				dress	
Period fo	or Reply					
THE - External - If the - If NO - Failu	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC assions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statustic to reply within the set or extended period for reply with reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no evenication. days, a reply within the statutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the appli	nt, however, may a reply be tory minimum of thirty (30) do l expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro cation to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely m the mailing date of this co IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	,					
1\⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 1 20 04				
· —		on <u>1-20-04</u> . o)⊠ This action is no	on-final			
-	Since this application is in condition for			rasposition as to the	marite is	
<u>ا</u> رد	closed in accordance with the practice	·			11161119 19	
		- and in the purite was	-y.o, 1000 O.D. 11, 1	1	•	
Disposit	ion of Claims			,		
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the ap	plication.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	withdrawn from cor	sideration.			
_	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ —	Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election re	equirement.			
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.				
_	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a		objected to by the	e Examiner.		
, _ _	Applicant may not request that any objecti		-			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	` ,	R 1.121(d)	
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to be	•	• • •	•	` '	
Priority :	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
		r forojan priority	or 251100 0 440/	a) (d) a= (f)		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	r loreign priontly und	ci 33 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(u) UI (I).		
a)l	1. Certified copies of the priority do	ncuments have been	n received			
				tion No		
	 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 					
	application from the Internationa			vou ni uno Nauullah	olay c	
* 🤇	See the attached detailed Office action	·	. ,,	ved.		
			iou oopioo ilot lecell			
Attachmen						
· —	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	2.046	4) Interview Summar	• •		
•	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT0 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT	,	Paper No(s)/Mail I Notice of Informal	Date Patent Application (PTO	-152)	
	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>01202004</u> .	. 5.55.00/	6) Other:	to be comment of the	-,	
	rademark Office	Office Action Comment		2 and and 12 and	4- 0F0F000	
TOL-326 (R	ev. 1-04)	Office Action Summar	y F	Part of Paper No./Mail Da	ite 05052005	

Application/Control Number: 10/612,448 Page 2

Art Unit: 1756

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
 - claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The terms S and D are not sufficiently described. The terms need to be described as related to the carrier and its solvated or dispersed state.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker (6,649,316) in view of Ooij (5,204,219). Baker teaches a liquid toner where an organosol has a reversible state caused by the application of heat energy (col. 2 lines 52-67). Ooij teach similar organosols where hydrogen bonding functionality of binder resins is employed to control gel rigidity (col. 12 lines 27-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Ooij with the developer of Baker to produce a liquid toner containing a reversible gel that is controlled by hydrogen bonding functionality because of the similarities of the disclosed

Art Unit: 1756

organosols and the known effect of the organosols in toner applications as taught by each reference.

Double Patenting

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-27 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of copending Application No. 10/612,182. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because similar three dimensional gel with reversible controlled rigidity are employed for the same purpose of reduced filming.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. Claims 1-27 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of copending Application No. 10/612,444. Although the conflicting claims are not identical,

Application/Control Number: 10/612,448

Art Unit: 1756

they are not patentably distinct from each other because similar three dimensional gel with reversible controlled rigidity are employed for the same purpose of reduced filming.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

- 8. Claims 1-27 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of copending Application No. 10/612,058. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because similar three dimensional gel with reversible controlled rigidity are employed for the same purpose of reduced filming.
- 9. This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Chapman whose telephone number is 571-272-1381. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/612,448

Art Unit: 1756

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Mark A. Chapman **Primary Examiner**

Page 5

Art Unit 1756

MC